

REMARKS

The enclosed is responsive to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on July 14, 2010. By way of the present response applicants have: 1) amended claim 28; 2) added no claims; and 3) canceled no claims. Applicants have amended claim 28 to incorporate subject matter that the Examiner has deemed allowable. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter this amendment after the Final Office Action in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.116 and MPEP §714.12. Applicants submit that the amendment is necessary and was not presented earlier because the Final Office Action includes a rejection based upon new grounds and a reference that was not previously cited. Furthermore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 has been amended incorporate subject matter that the Examiner has deemed allowable and, therefore, the present amendment places the application in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by U.S Patent No. 5,650,640 by Stafford et al, ("Stafford").

Applicants respectfully submit that Stafford fails to disclose "depositing a plurality of electroluminescent elements on a transparent substrate." (Amended claim 28). In contrast, Stafford describes that the electroluminescent media 35 are deposited on a transparent conductive strip 30, which is itself deposited on the transparent substrate 10. (Stafford, col. 7, lines 12-16 and Figs. 6, 8, and 12).

Furthermore, applicants respectfully submit that Stafford is silent regarding

depositing a conductive element on the top of each dielectric element, ***the conductive elements arranged to supply a voltage across each of the plurality of electroluminescent elements in a direction substantially parallel to the surface of the transparent substrate.***

(Amended claim 28) (emphasis added).

Additionally, as stated by the Examiner, “the prior art of record neither shows nor suggest ... wherein a plurality of conductive elements are arranged so as to apply a voltage across each of the plurality of electroluminescent elements in a direction substantially parallel to the surface of the transparent substrate.” (Office Action dated 7/14/10, page 3).

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claim 28 has been overcome.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner’s allowance of claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22, 24-27, and 29-31 is noted with appreciation.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable objections and rejections have been overcome.

Applicants reserve all rights under the doctrine of equivalents.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a)(3), applicants hereby request and authorize the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to (1) treat any concurrent or future reply that requires a petition for extension of time as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time and (2) charge all required fees, including extension of time fees and fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17, to Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: Sept. 14, 2010

/Ryan W. Elliott/

Ryan W. Elliott

Reg. No. 60,156

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300